arXiv:1704.05338v1 [math.GR] 18 Apr 2017

ON WHITEHEAD'S FIRST FREE-GROUP ALGORITHM, CUTVERTICES, AND FREE-PRODUCT FACTORIZATIONS

WARREN DICKS*

ABSTRACT. Let F be any finite-rank free group, X be any F-basis, and R be any finite subset of $(F-\{1\}) \cup \big\{F\text{-conjugacy classes of } F-\{1\}\big\}$. By an R-alloting F-factorization, we mean a free-product factorization $F = \mathop{*}_{H\in\mathcal{H}} H$ such that $\{1\} \notin \mathcal{H}$ and each element of R belongs to, or intersects, some $H \in \mathcal{H}$. An R-alloting F-factorization is said to be atomic if no proper free-product refinement of it is R-alloting.

Whitehead's cutvertex algorithm, with input X and R, outputs some R-cutvertex-free F-basis Y. We use the Cayley tree for Y to prove that, for some partition $\mathcal{P}$ of Y, $\mathop{*}_{P\in\mathcal{P}} \langle P\rangle$ is an atomic R-alloting F-factorization. This result unifies and generalizes results of Whitehead, Shenitzer, Berge, Bestvina, Stong, and Stallings, and gives an algorithm that outputs an atomic R-alloting F-factorization.

0. Outline and background

By a *straight word in* a group G, we mean an element of G. By a *cyclic word in* G, we mean the G-conjugacy class of an element of G. A *word* may be straight or cyclic.

Throughout this article, let F be any finite-rank free group, X be any F-basis (a free generating set for F), and R be any finite set of nontrivial words in F. We say R is *entirely straight*, resp. *entirely cyclic*, if every element of R is a straight word, resp. a cyclic word.

A free-product factorization $F = \mathop{*}_{H\in\mathcal{H}} H$ is called an *R-alloting F-factorization* if $\{1\} \notin \mathcal{H}$, each straight word contained in R belongs to some $H \in \mathcal{H}$, and each cyclic word contained in R intersects some $H \in \mathcal{H}$. An R-alloting F-factorization is said to be *atomic* if no proper free-product refinement of it is R-alloting.

In Section 1, we use the Kurosch subgroup theorem to show that atomic R-alloting F-factorizations are as unique as may reasonably be expected, and they all induce the same partition of R.

In Section 2, we show that, for the partition $\mathcal{P}$ of X generated by the X-supports of the elements of R, $\mathop{*}_{P\in\mathcal{P}} \langle P\rangle$ is the (unique) atomic $(R\cup X)$-alloting F-factorization.

In Section 3, we define R-cutvertex-free F-bases, making Sections 4 and 5 mutually independent.

In Section 4, we present Whitehead's cutvertex algorithm, which, with input X and R, outputs an R-cutvertex-free F-basis. Here and throughout, the word 'algorithm' will be used in the sense of a procedure with choices whose output, which may depend on those choices, has some specified property.

In Section 5, we use the Cayley tree for X to prove Theorem 5.2, which says that if X is R-cutvertex free, then the atomic $(R\cup X)$-alloting F-factorization is an atomic R-alloting F-factorization.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 20E05; Secondary 20E06, 20F10, 05C40.

Key words and phrases. Whitehead's cutvertex theorem, free products.

*Research supported by MINECO (Spain) through project number MTM2014-53644.

Altogether, we get a (simple) algorithm that outputs an atomic R-alloting F-factorization. This could be useful in a study of a finite presentation. When $|R| = 1$, what this algorithm finds is the (unique) smallest free-product factor of F which contains a given element of F.

Important cases of Theorem 5.2 were known, each having been proved at least once with three-manifolds, and at least once with graphs. Whitehead(1936a, Lemma) used three-manifolds to prove his *cutvertex lemma*, part of which shows that if R is an F-sub-basis (a subset of an F-basis) and X is R-cutvertex free, then $R \subseteq X \cup X^{-1}$; in our language, the F-factorization $\ast_{x\in X} \langle x\rangle$ is R-alloting.[1] The remaining part shows the analogous result where R is entirely cyclic. It may be seen that these are cases of Theorem 5.2 where R has the property that, in each atomic R-alloting F-factorization, all the free-product factors have rank one. Algorithm 4.4 below constructs an F-basis Z, which is R-cutvertex free by the cutvertex algorithm; the *cutvertex theorem* of Whitehead(1936a, Theorem) is the case of the cutvertex lemma where $X = Z$. Shenitzer(1955) proved the case of Theorem 5.2 where $|R| = 1$ and $X = Z$. Gersten(1984) announced that he had a graph-theoretic proof of the cutvertex lemma; later, Hoare(1988) gave such a proof. Other important cases of Theorem 5.2 were proved by Berge(1993), Bestvina(1995), Stong(1997), and Stallings(1999). Stallings knew and publicized Berge's work, but, with this one exception, the work of all four was created independently of the others. Berge and Bestvina proved the case where $|R| = 1$, by using three-manifolds and Cayley trees, respectively. Stong and Stallings proved the case where R is entirely cyclic, by using Cayley trees and three-manifolds, respectively. Stong used three-manifolds to prove the case where R is entirely straight, and Dicks(2014) gave a Cayley-tree proof; this case gives a simple algorithm for finding the smallest free-product factor of F which contains a given finite subset of F. Theorem 5.2 generalizes and unifies all the preceding results.

1. Atomic R-alloting F-factorizations

Recall that F is a finite-rank free group and R is a finite set of nontrivial words in F.

1.1. **Definitions.** For any family $\mathcal{H}$ of subgroups of F, we write $\ast\mathcal{H} := \ast_{H\in\mathcal{H}} H$ for the free product of the family. There exists a natural map $\ast\mathcal{H} \to F$. If the latter map is an isomorphism, then we write $F = \ast\mathcal{H}$ and say $\ast\mathcal{H}$ *is a free-product factorization of* F. If $F = \ast\mathcal{H}$, then, for any $H_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{H}$ and $g_1, g_2 \in F$, if ${}^{g_1}H_1 \cap {}^{g_2}H_2 \neq \{1\}$ in F, then $g_1H_1 = g_2H_2$ in F, and $H_1 = H_2$ in $\mathcal{H}$ and in F; for example, this follows from the result of Serre(1977, I.5.3.12) that if $\mathcal{H} \neq \emptyset$, then the disjoint union of the left F-sets F/H, $H \in \mathcal{H}$, is the vertex-set of a left F-tree with trivial edge stabilizers. If $\{1\} \notin \mathcal{H}$, then $\mathcal{H} = \{\langle P\rangle : P \in \mathcal{P}\}$, for some partition $\mathcal{P}$ of some F-basis.

By an *R-alloting F-factorization* $\ast\mathcal{H}$, we mean any free-product factorization of F such that $\{1\} \notin \mathcal{H}$, each straight word $r \in R$ belongs to some $H \in \mathcal{H}$, and each cyclic word $r \in R$ intersects some $H \in \mathcal{H}$, which implies that $r \cap H$ is a cyclic word in H; in each case, H is uniquely determined by r, and we say that r *is alloted to the factor* H. For each $H \in \mathcal{H}$,

[1] Whitehead's cutvertex arguments gave the first-ever algorithm that tested for sub-bases, and I believe it is the fastest one known. Whitehead(1936b, Theorem 3) immediately afterward gave a very general algorithm, which, in particular, tested for sub-bases. If he had presented (1936a) and (1936b) in the reverse order, perhaps his cutvertex results would have been mentioned in the literature more often than they have been. Alistair Cooke(1968, p. 248) attributes to George Kaufman the remark that if matches had been invented after the cigarette lighter, they would have been the sensation of the twentieth century.

we write $R_{|H,\mathcal{H}}$ or $R_{|H}$ to denote the set of elements of R which are alloted to H; then $\{R_{|H} : H \in \mathcal{H}\} - \{\emptyset\}$ is a partition of R. We sometimes view $R_{|H}$ as a finite set of nontrivial words in H. If $F = \{1\}$, then $R = \emptyset$, and here setting $\mathcal{H} = \emptyset$ gives an R-alloting F-factorization. If $F \neq \{1\}$, then setting $\mathcal{H} = \{F\}$ gives an R-alloting F-factorization; if it is the only one, then we say that F is an *R-atom*. An R-alloting F-factorization $*\,\mathcal{H}$ is said to be *atomic* if each $H \in \mathcal{H}$ is an $R_{|H}$-atom. Since F has finite rank, there exists some atomic R-alloting F-factorization. □

1.2. **Proposition.** *All the atomic R-alloting F-factorizations induce the same partition of R. They all have the same factor to which r is alloted, for each straight word $r \in R$. They all have the same F-conjugacy class of the factor to which r is alloted, for each cyclic word $r \in R$. The factors to which no elements of R are alloted have rank one.*

Proof. Consider any two atomic R-alloting F-factorizations $*\,\mathcal{H}$ and $*\,\mathcal{K}$, and any $H \in \mathcal{H}$.

By the subgroup theorem of Kurosch(1934), H has a free-product factorization

$$H_0 * \mathop{*}_{K\in\mathcal{K}} \mathop{*}_{a\in A_{H,K}} (H \cap {}^aK), \tag{1.2.1}$$

where H_0 is a certain subgroup of H such that $H_0 - \{1\}$ is disjoint from every F-conjugate of every element of $\mathcal{K}$, and, for each $K \in \mathcal{K}$, $A_{H,K}$ is a certain subset of F such that $1 \in A_{H,K}$ and the map $A_{H,K} \to H\backslash F/K$, $a \mapsto H{\cdot}a{\cdot}K$, is bijective. See Serre(1977, I.5.5.14).

Consider any $r \in R_{|H,\mathcal{H}}$. There exists a (necessarily unique) $K \in \mathcal{K}$ such that if r is a straight word, then $r \in H$ and $r \in K$, while if r is a cyclic word, then r contains an element h of H and an element k of K. In the former event, $r \in H \cap {}^1K$. In the latter event, since r is an F-conjugacy class, $h = {}^gk$ for some $g \in F$, and then $g = h'{\cdot}a{\cdot}k'$ for some $(h', a, k') \in H \times A_{H,K} \times K$, and then r contains ${}^{h'^{-1}}h = {}^{a\cdot k'}k \in H \cap {}^aK$. Thus, we obtain an $R_{|H,\mathcal{H}}$-alloting H-factorization by omitting from (1.2.1) all the trivial free-product factors.

Since $*\,\mathcal{H}$ is an atomic R-alloting F-factorization, H is an $R_{|H,\mathcal{H}}$-atom, and there are three possibilities. If $R_{|H,\mathcal{H}} = \emptyset$, then H has rank one. If $R_{|H,\mathcal{H}}$ is not entirely cyclic, then $H = H \cap K$ and $R_{|H,\mathcal{H}} \subseteq R_{|K,\mathcal{K}}$; by symmetry, $K = K \cap H = H$ and $R_{|H,\mathcal{H}} = R_{|K,\mathcal{K}}$. If $R_{|H,\mathcal{H}}$ is entirely cyclic and is nonempty, then $H = H \cap {}^aK$ and $R_{|H,\mathcal{H}} \subseteq R_{|K,\mathcal{K}}$; by symmetry, K is also included in an F-conjugate of H, and we see that $H = {}^aK$ and $R_{|H,\mathcal{H}} = R_{|K,\mathcal{K}}$. The result now follows. □

2. Atomic $(R \cup X)$-alloting F-factorizations

Recall that F is a finite-rank free group, X is an F-basis, and R is a finite set of nontrivial words in F.

2.1. **Definitions.** Set $X^{\pm1} := X \cup X^{-1}$. An *$X^{\pm1}$-sequence* is any ℓ-tuple $\sigma = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_\ell)$ of elements of $X^{\pm1}$ for any non-negative integer ℓ. We say that σ is *reduced* if $x_i \neq x_{i-1}^{-1}$ for each $i \in \{2, 3, \ldots, \ell\}$, and that σ is *cyclically reduced* if $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_\ell, x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_\ell)$ is reduced. For each word r in F, we say that r *possesses* σ if either r is a straight word and $x_1x_2\cdots x_\ell = r$, or r is a cyclic word and $x_1x_2\cdots x_\ell \in r$. Each straight word r possesses a reduced $X^{\pm1}$-sequence $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_\ell)$ and it is unique; we call it the reduced $X^{\pm1}$-sequence *for* r, and set X-length$(r) := \ell$ and X-support$(r) := \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_\ell\}^{\pm1} \cap X$. Each cyclic word r possesses a cyclically reduced $X^{\pm1}$-sequence $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_\ell)$, and it is unique up to cyclic permutation; we set X-length$(r) := \ell$ and X-support$(r) := \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_\ell\}^{\pm1} \cap X$. We set X-length$(R) := \sum_{r\in R} X$-length(r) and X-support$(R) := \bigcup_{r\in R} X$-support$(r) \subseteq X$. □

2.2. **Definitions.** For a set $\mathcal{S}$ of subsets of X such that $\mathcal{S} = \emptyset$ if $X = \emptyset$, the *partition of X generated by $\mathcal{S}$* is the finest partition $\mathcal{P}$ of X such that, for each $S \in \mathcal{S}$, there exists $P \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $S \subseteq P$. Thus, the intersection of all those equivalence relations on X that include $\bigcup_{S\in\mathcal{S}} (S \times S)$ is the equivalence relation $\bigcup_{P\in\mathcal{P}} (P \times P)$. We may define a procedure whereby, for any set of subsets of X, if we find a pair of the subsets that intersect, then we replace those two with their union, and obtain a new set of subsets of X. If we start with $\mathcal{S} \cup \big\{\{x\} : x \in X\big\}$ and repeat this procedure as often as possible, we obtain $\mathcal{P}$. □

We next see that in searching for an atomic R-alloting F-factorization, we may assume F is an $(R \cup X)$-atom, that is, the partition of X generated by $\{X\text{-support}(r) : r \in R\}$ is $\{X\}$.

2.3. **Proposition.** *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the partition of X generated by $\{X\text{-support}(r) : r \in R\}$, and set $\mathcal{H} := \big\{\langle P\rangle : P \in \mathcal{P}\big\}$. Then $\ast\,\mathcal{H}$ is the unique atomic $(R \cup X)$-alloting F-factorization. For each $H \in \mathcal{H}$, $X_{|H}$ is the H-basis in $\mathcal{P}$, $R_{|H}$ is a finite set of nontrivial words in H, and H is an $(R_{|H} \cup X_{|H})$-atom.*

Proof. Let $\ast\,\mathcal{K}$ be any atomic $(R \cup X)$-alloting F-factorization. Since $\ast\,\mathcal{K}$ is X-alloting, we have a partition $\{X_{|K} : K \in \mathcal{K}\} - \{\emptyset\}$ of X. For each $K \in \mathcal{K}$, $X_{|K} = X \cap K$ is clearly a basis of the subgroup $\langle X_{|K}\rangle$ of K. Then

$$\underset{K\in\mathcal{K}}{\ast} \langle X_{|K}\rangle = \langle X\rangle = F = \underset{K\in\mathcal{K}}{\ast} K.$$

It follows by a normal-form argument that, for each $K \in \mathcal{K}$, $\langle X_{|K}\rangle = K$; hence, $X_{|K}$ is a K-basis, and, hence, $X_{|K} \neq \emptyset$. Thus, $\mathcal{X} := \{X_{|K} : K \in \mathcal{K}\}$ is a partition of X. As $\ast\,\mathcal{K}$ is also R-alloting, $\{R_{|K} : K \in \mathcal{K}\} - \{\emptyset\}$ is a partition of R, and, for each $K \in \mathcal{K}$, $R_{|K}$ is a set of nontrivial words in K, which means precisely that, for each $r \in R_{|K}$, $X\text{-support}(r) \subseteq X_{|K} \in \mathcal{X}$. From the atomicity of $\ast\,\mathcal{K}$, we see that $\mathcal{X}$ is the partition of X generated by $\{X\text{-support}(r) : r \in R\}$. The result is now clear. □

3. R-cutvertex-free F-bases

3.1. **Definitions.** By a *graph* Γ, we mean a set V together with a subset E of $V\times V$. Then V is called the *vertex-set* of Γ, denoted $\mathrm{V}\Gamma$, and its elements are called Γ-*vertices*, while E is called the *edge-set* of Γ, denoted $\mathrm{E}\Gamma$, and its elements are called Γ-*edges*. We say that an element (v, w) of $V\times V$ *touches* v and w, and *joins* v to w and w to v; we extend the usage to subsets of V, and say, for example, that (v, w) *joins* v to any subset of V containing w. A Γ-vertex v is said to be a Γ-*cutvertex* if $V-\{v\}$ equals the union of two disjoint, nonempty subsets V_1 and V_2 such that no Γ-edge joins V_1 to V_2. For any set A and any map $\chi : V \to A$, $v \mapsto \chi(v)$, we say that an element (v, w) of $V\times V$ is χ-*split* if $\chi(v) \neq \chi(w)$, and is χ-*constant* if $\chi(v) = \chi(w)$; here, if v is a Γ-vertex such that $|\chi(V-\{v\})| = 2$ and each χ-split Γ-edge touches v, then v is a Γ-cutvertex. This characterizes Γ-cutvertices. □

3.2. **Definitions.** We write $\iota(\{1\} \cup X^{\pm1})$ to denote a set given with a bijective map $\iota : \{1\} \cup X^{\pm1} \to \iota(\{1\} \cup X^{\pm1})$, $x \mapsto \iota x$. For each $x \in \{1\} \cup X^{\pm1}$, we set $\tau x := \iota(x^{-1})$. In particular, $\tau 1 = \iota 1$. By an X-*turn*, we mean an element of $\big(\iota(\{1\} \cup X^{\pm1})\big) \times \big(\iota(\{1\} \cup X^{\pm1})\big)$.

Each straight word r in F possesses a reduced $X^{\pm1}$-sequence $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_\ell)$ and it is unique; here, we set $x_0 := x_{\ell+1} := 1$ and $X\text{-turns}(r) := \{(\tau x_i, \iota x_{i+1}) : 0 \leqslant i \leqslant \ell\}$. In particular, $X\text{-turns}(1) = \{(\tau 1, \iota 1)\}$.

Each cyclic word r in F possesses a cyclically reduced $X^{\pm1}$-sequence $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_\ell)$, and it is unique up to cyclic permutation. If $\ell \geqslant 1$, we view these subscripts as elements of $\mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z}$, and set $X\text{-turns}(r) := \{(\tau x_i, \iota x_{i+1}) : i \in \mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z}\}$, while if $\ell = 0$, we set $X\text{-turns}(r) := \emptyset$. It is not difficult to see that, for each $g \in r$, $X\text{-turns}(r) \subseteq X\text{-turns}(g^2)$.

We set $X\text{-turns}(R) := \bigcup_{r\in R} X\text{-turns}(r)$. The elements of $X\text{-turns}(R)$ are called the *X-turns of R*, and similarly for any word in F. We write $\mathbb{W}(X, R)$ to denote the graph such that $\mathrm{V}\mathbb{W}(X, R)$ is the set of elements of $\iota(\{1\} \cup X^{\pm1})$ which are touched by some X-turn of R, and $\mathrm{E}\,\mathbb{W}(X, R) := X\text{-turns}(R)$. Thus, each vertex is touched by some edge, and $\iota 1 \in \mathrm{V}\mathbb{W}(X, R)$ if and only if R is not entirely cyclic. Since no element of R is trivial, no edge joins a vertex to itself. If $R = \emptyset$, then $\mathbb{W}(X, R)$ is the empty graph.

By an (X, R)-*cutvertex*, we mean a $\mathbb{W}(X, R)$-cutvertex which is contained in $\iota(X^{\pm1})$.

Let $*\,\mathcal{H}$ be the atomic $(R \cup X)$-alloting F-factorization of Proposition 2.3. We say that X is *R-cutvertex free* if, for each $H \in \mathcal{H}$, there exist no $(X_{|H}, R_{|H})$-cutvertices. □

We shall speak of (X, R)-cutvertices only when F is an $(R \cup X)$-atom, in which case either $X\text{-support}(R) = X$ and, hence, $\iota(X^{\pm1}) \subseteq \mathrm{V}\mathbb{W}(X, R)$, or $|X| = 1$, $R = \emptyset$, and, hence, $\mathrm{V}\mathbb{W}(X, R) = \emptyset$. When F is an $(R \cup X)$-atom, we will have the dichotomy that when there exists *some* (X, R)-cutvertex, Subroutine 4.2 will construct an F-basis X' such that $X'\text{-length}(R) < X\text{-length}(R)$, and when there exist *no* (X, R)-cutvertices, Lemma 5.1 will show that F is an R-atom (Gr. *ἄτομος* 'no cut').

4. Whitehead's cutvertex algorithm

We give two algorithms which, with input X and R, output R-cutvertex-free F-bases.

4.1. **Definition.** For any $y \in X^{\pm1}$ and any map $\gamma : X^{\pm1} \to \{1, y\}$ such that $\gamma(y^{-1}) = \gamma y$, we say that the F-basis $\{(\gamma x)^{-1} \cdot x \cdot \gamma(x^{-1}) : x \in X\}$ is a *Whitehead transform of X*. □

Whitehead, Stong, Stallings, and Dicks gave variations of the following.

4.2. **Subroutine.** Suppose that F is an $(R \cup X)$-atom, and that, for some $z \in X^{\pm1}$, ιz is a $\mathbb{W}(X, R)$-cutvertex. We shall construct a Whitehead transform X' of X such that $X'\text{-length}(R) < X\text{-length}(R)$.

Set $V := \mathrm{V}\mathbb{W}(X, R)$. Then $V - \{\iota 1\} = \iota(X^{\pm1})$, since F is an $(R \cup X)$-atom and $V \neq \emptyset$.

Step 1. We shall now find some $y \in X^{\pm1}$ such that $V - \{\iota y\}$ equals the union of two disjoint, nonempty subsets V_ι and V_τ, and, also, $\tau y \in V_\tau$, some $\mathbb{W}(X, R)$-edge joins ιy to V_ι, and no $\mathbb{W}(X, R)$-edge joins V_ι to V_τ.

Since ιz is a $\mathbb{W}(X, R)$-cutvertex, $V - \{\iota z\}$ equals the union of two disjoint, nonempty subsets V_1 and V_2 such that no $\mathbb{W}(X, R)$-edge joins V_1 to V_2. By interchanging V_1 and V_2 if necessary, we may assume that $\tau z \in V_2$. There are two cases.

Case 1.1: Some $\mathbb{W}(X, R)$-edge joins ιz to V_1.

Here, we set $y := z$, $V_\iota := V_1$, and $V_\tau := V_2$.

Case 1.2: No $\mathbb{W}(X, R)$-edge joins ιz to V_1.

Here, V is the union of two disjoint, nonempty subsets $V_1^+ := V_1$ and $V_2^+ := V_2 \cup \{\iota z\}$, and no $\mathbb{W}(X, R)$-edge joins V_1^+ to V_2^+. For each $k \in \{1, 2\}$, $|V_k^+| \geqslant 2$, since, in $\mathbb{W}(X, R)$, each vertex is touched by some edge, and no edge joins a vertex to itself. If, for each $k \in \{1, 2\}$, there exists a (necessarily nonempty) subset X_k of X such that $V_k^+ - \{\iota 1\} = \iota(X_k^{\pm1})$, then each X-turn of R is an X_k-turn for some $k \in \{1, 2\}$, and then

$\langle X_1\rangle * \langle X_2\rangle$ is an $(R\cup X)$-alloting F-factorization, which contradicts the hypothesis that F is an $(R\cup X)$-atom. This proves that we can find some $y \in X^{\pm 1}$ such that $\iota y \in V_1^+$ and $\tau y \in V_2^+$. Now ιy is touched by at least one $\mathbb{W}(X,R)$-edge, which must join ιy to $V_1^+ - \{\iota y\}$. Hence, $V - \{\iota y\}$ equals the union of two disjoint, nonempty subsets $V_\iota := V_1^+ - \{\iota y\}$ and $V_\tau := V_2^+$ such that $\tau y \in V_\tau$, some $\mathbb{W}(X,R)$-edge joins ιy to V_ι, and no $\mathbb{W}(X,R)$-edge joins V_ι to V_τ.

Then y, V_ι, and V_τ are defined in both cases. Step 1 is complete.

Step 2. We now find some $m \in \{0,-1\}$ and some map $\chi : \iota(\{1\}\cup X^{\pm 1}) \to \{m, m+1\}$ such that all of the following hold: every χ-split X-turn of R touches ιy; there exists at least one χ-split X-turn of R; $\chi(\iota 1) = 0$; and, $\chi(\iota y) = \chi(\tau y) = m$.

There are two cases.

Case 2.1: $\iota 1 \in V_\iota$.

Set $m := -1$, and let $\chi : \iota(\{1\}\cup X^{\pm 1}) \to \{0,-1\}$ be the map which carries V_ι to $\{0\}$ and carries $V_\tau \cup \{\iota y\}$ to $\{-1\}$. Then $\chi(\iota 1) = 0$ and $\chi(\iota y) = \chi(\tau y) = -1 = m$.

Case 2.2: $\iota 1 \notin V_\iota$.

Set $m := 0$, and let $\chi : \iota(\{1\}\cup X^{\pm 1}) \to \{0,1\}$ be the map which carries $V_\tau \cup \{\iota y, \iota 1\}$ to $\{0\}$ and carries V_ι to $\{1\}$. Then $\chi(\iota 1) = \chi(\iota y) = \chi(\tau y) = 0 = m$.

Then m and χ are defined in both cases, and the χ-split X-turns of R are precisely the $\mathbb{W}(X,R)$-edges which join ιy to V_ι, of which there exists at least one. Step 2 is complete.

Step 3. For each $x \in X^{\pm 1}$, set $x' := y^{-\chi(\iota x)} x y^{\chi(\tau x)}$. Then $(x')^{-1} = (x^{-1})'$, $y' = y$, and $X' := \{x' : x \in X\}$ is a Whitehead transform of X. To prove X'-length$(R) <$ X-length(R) it suffices to prove that, for each $r \in R$,

(4.2.1) $\qquad X'$-length$(r) \leqslant X$-length(r) minus the number of χ-split X-turns of r.

Set $\ell :=$ X-length$(r) \geqslant 1$; then r possesses some $X^{\pm 1}$-sequence $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_\ell)$. If r is a straight word, set $x_0 := x_{\ell+1} := 1$; if r is a cyclic word, set $x_0 := x_\ell$ and $x_{\ell+1} := x_1$. Each X-turn of r equals $(\tau x_i, \iota x_{i+1})$ for some $i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, \ell\}$; here, $\chi\big(\{\tau x_i, \iota x_{i+1}\} - \{\iota y\}\big)$ contains exactly one element, which will be denoted n_i. Set

$$g := \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} (y^{-n_{i-1}} x_i y^{n_i}) = y^{-n_0} (\prod_{i=1}^{\ell} x_i) y^{n_\ell}.$$

If r is a straight word, then $n_0 = \chi(\tau x_0) = 0$ and $n_\ell = \chi(\iota x_{\ell+1}) = 0$; here, $g = r$. If r is a cyclic word, then $n_0 = n_\ell$; here, $g \in r$. To prove (4.2.1) it suffices to prove that, for each $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, \ell\}$,

$$y^{-n_{i-1}} x_i y^{n_i} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (\tau x_{i-1}, \iota x_i) \text{ is } \chi\text{-split with } \iota x_i = \iota y, \\ 1 & \text{if } (\tau x_i, \iota x_{i+1}) \text{ is } \chi\text{-split with } \tau x_i = \iota y, \\ x_i' & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{4.2.2}$$

There are three cases.

Case 3.1: $(\tau x_{i-1}, \iota x_i)$ is χ-split with $\iota x_i = \iota y$; equivalently, $n_{i-1} \neq \chi(\iota x_i)$.

Here, $n_{i-1} = m+1$, $\tau x_i \neq \iota y$, $n_i = \chi(\tau x_i) = m$, and (4.2.2) holds.

Case 3.2: $(\tau x_i, \iota x_{i+1})$ is χ-split with $\tau x_i = \iota y$; equivalently, $n_i \neq \chi(\tau x_i)$.

Here, $\iota x_i \neq \iota y$, $n_{i-1} = \chi(\iota x_i) = m$, $n_i = m+1$, and (4.2.2) holds.

Case 3.3: $n_{i-1} = \chi(\iota x_i)$ and $n_i = \chi(\tau x_i)$.

Here, $y^{-n_{i-1}} x_i y^{n_i} = y^{-\chi(\iota x_i)} x_i y^{\chi(\tau x_i)} = x_i'$, and (4.2.2) holds.

Step 3 and Subroutine 4.2 are complete. □

4.3. **Whitehead's cut-vertex algorithm.** This algorithm first finds the atomic $(R \cup X)$-alloting F-factorization $* \mathcal{H}$ of Proposition 2.3. It then either (A) finds some $H \in \mathcal{H}$ and some $(X_{|H}, R_{|H})$-cutvertex, or (B) determines that X is R-cutvertex free. For (B), it outputs X, and stops. For (A), as H is an $(R_{|H} \cup X_{|H})$-atom, Subroutine 4.2 constructs a Whitehead transform $(X_{|H})'$ of $X_{|H}$ such that $(X_{|H})'$-length$(R_{|H}) <$ $(X_{|H})$-length$(R_{|H})$, and now the process starts anew with X replaced with $X' := (X - (X_{|H})) \cup (X_{|H})'$, which is a Whitehead transform of X such that X'-length$(R) <$ X-length(R). This algorithm eventually outputs an R-cutvertex-free F-basis, and stops. □

4.4. **Algorithm.** Since X-length(R) is finite and there exist only finitely many Whitehead transforms of any F-basis, one may find a sequence of Whitehead transforms of F-bases which decreases length(R) strictly at each step, and eventually outputs an F-basis Z such that Z'-length$(R) \geqslant Z$-length(R) for each Whitehead transform Z' of Z. An application of Algorithm 4.3 shows that Z is R-cutvertex free. □

5. A generalization of Whitehead's cutvertex lemma

We show that if X is R-cutvertex-free, then the atomic $(R \cup X)$-alloting F-factorization is an atomic R-alloting F-factorization. Whitehead, Berge, Bestvina, Stong, and Stallings proved various cases of the following. For the proof, we modify an argument of Dicks.

5.1. **Lemma.** *Suppose that F is an $(R \cup X)$-atom. If F is not an R-atom, then there exists some (X, R)-cutvertex.*

Proof. Since F is not an R-atom, there exists some R-alloting F-factorization $H_1 * H_2$.

Fix any $\hbar \in (H_1 \cup H_2) - \{1\}$. There exists some $f \in F$ such that the reduced $X^{\pm 1}$-sequence for $\hbar^f$ is cyclically reduced. If R is entirely cyclic, then $H_1^f * H_2^f$ is an R-alloting F-factorization, and we replace H_1, H_2, $\hbar$ with H_1^f, H_2^f, $\hbar^f$, respectively, and take $f = 1$. This will be used near the end of the proof.

Since F is an $(R \cup X)$-atom, the R-alloting F-factorization $H_1 * H_2$ cannot be X-alloting. Hence, $X - (H_1 \cup H_2) \neq \emptyset$. This is the important condition. Notice that $|X| \geqslant 2$.

Let $\lambda : (H_1 \cup H_2) - \{1\} \to \{1, 2\}$ be the map such that $\lambda(H_k - \{1\}) = \{k\}$, $k = 1, 2$. Consider any $g \in F$. There exists a unique expression $g = h_1 h_2 \cdots h_n$ such that n is a non-negative integer, $h_j \in (H_1 \cup H_2) - \{1\}$ for $1 \leqslant j \leqslant n$, and $\lambda(h_j) \neq \lambda(h_{j-1})$ for $2 \leqslant j \leqslant n$. If $n = 0$, we set $\kappa(g) := 0$, while if $n \geqslant 1$, we set $\kappa(g) := \lambda(h_1) \in \{1, 2\}$; we then have a map $\kappa : F \to \{0, 1, 2\}$. If $n \geqslant 1$, it is not difficult to show by induction on n that

$$\{v \in F : \kappa(vg) \neq \kappa(v)\} = \{h_j^{-1} \cdots h_2^{-1} h_1^{-1} : 0 \leqslant j \leqslant n\}.$$

We record the three key consequences.

(5.1.1) For each $x \in X^{\pm 1}$, $\big|\{v \in F : \kappa(vx) \neq \kappa(v)\}\big| < \infty$.

(5.1.2) There exist $x \in X - (H_1 \cup H_2)$ and $v \in F - \{1, x^{-1}\}$ such that $\kappa(vx) \neq \kappa(v)$.

(5.1.3) For each $h \in H_1 \cup H_2$ and each $w \in F - \{1, h^{-1}\}$, $\kappa(wh) = \kappa(w)$.

For each reduced $X^{\pm 1}$-sequence $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_\ell)$ and each $i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, \ell\}$, we say that $x_1 x_2 \cdots x_\ell$ is an *extension of* $x_1 x_2 \cdots x_i$. If $\ell \geqslant 1$, we set $\partial(x_1 x_2 \cdots x_{\ell-1} x_\ell) := x_1 x_2 \cdots x_{\ell-1}$.

For each $v \in F$, let $v\star$ denote the set of all extensions of v. Let T denote the graph with $\mathrm{V}T = F$ and $\mathrm{E}T = \big\{(\partial u, u) : u \in F - \{1\}\big\} \subseteq F \times F$. It is not difficult to see that T is a tree oriented away from 1. Each T-edge is of the form (v, vx) for some $(v, x) \in F \times X^{\pm 1}$; since $X^{\pm 1}$ is finite, it follows from (5.1.1) that only finitely many T-edges are κ-split. For

each $(v,x) \in F \times X^{\pm 1}$, one of (v, vx) and (vx, v) is a T-edge; it follows from (5.1.2) that some κ-split T-edge does not touch 1. We may therefore fix, for the remainder of the proof, a κ-split T-edge (v, vx_+), $v \in F$, $x_+ \in X^{\pm 1}$, which maximizes X-length(v); as some κ-split T-edge does not touch 1, the maximality of X-length(v) implies that $v \neq 1$. Clearly, $vx_+ \neq 1$. By interchanging H_1 and H_2 if necessary, we may assume that $\kappa(v) = 1$ and $\kappa(vx_+) = 2$.

Set $x_- := (v^{-1})(\partial v) \in X^{\pm 1}$; then (vx_-, v) is a T-edge and $x_- \neq x_+$.

For each $x \in X^{\pm 1} - \{x_-\}$, (v, vx) is a T-edge, $(v)(x\star) = (vx)\star$, $(vx)\star$ is the vertex-set of a subtree of T whose edges are κ-constant by the maximality of X-length(v), and, hence, κ is constant on $(vx)\star$.

Since $|X| \geqslant 2$ and F is an $(R \cup X)$-atom, $\mathrm{V}\mathbb{W}(X,R) = \iota(X^{\pm 1})$ if R is entirely cyclic, and $\mathrm{V}\mathbb{W}(X,R) = \iota(\{1\} \cup X^{\pm 1})$ if R is not entirely cyclic. We shall show that ιx_- is an (X,R)-cutvertex.

We define a map $\chi : \iota(\{1\} \cup X^{\pm 1}) \to \{0,1,2\}$ by $x \mapsto \chi(\iota x) := \kappa(vx)$. Here, if $x \neq x_-$, then $vx \neq 1$ and, hence, $\chi(\iota x) \in \{1,2\}$. Now $\iota(\{1\} \cup X^{\pm 1} - \{x_-\})$ equals the union of two disjoint subsets V_1 and V_2 with $\chi(V_k) = \{k\}$, $k = 1,2$. Notice that $\iota 1 \in V_1$ and $\iota x_+ \in V_2$.

We shall now show that, for each $h \in H_1 \cup H_2$, no X-turn of h joins V_1 to V_2.

Let $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_\ell)$ be the reduced $X^{\pm 1}$-sequence for h, and set $x_0 := x_{\ell+1} := 1$. Each X-turn of h equals $(\tau x_i, \iota x_{i+1})$ for some $i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, \ell\}$, and we wish to show that this does not join V_1 to V_2. In particular, we may assume that it does not touch ιx_-, that is, $x_- \notin \{x_i^{-1}, x_{i+1}\}$. In F, set

$$w := v x_i^{-1} x_{i-1}^{-1} \cdots x_1^{-1}; \text{ then } wh = v x_{i+1} x_{i+2} \cdots x_\ell.$$

It suffices to prove that $\chi(\tau x_i) \overset{\text{def}\,\chi}{=} \kappa(vx_i^{-1}) = \kappa(w) = \kappa(wh) = \kappa(vx_{i+1}) \overset{\text{def}\,\chi}{=} \chi(\iota x_{i+1})$.

We first show that $0 \neq \kappa(vx_i^{-1}) = \kappa(w)$. If $i = 0$, then $vx_i^{-1} = v = w$. If $i \neq 0$, then $x_i^{-1} \in X^{\pm 1} - \{x_-\}$; here, κ is constant on $(vx_i^{-1})\star = (v)(x_i^{-1}\star) \supseteq \{vx_i^{-1}, w\}$. In both cases, the desired result is clear.

We next show that $\kappa(wh) = \kappa(vx_{i+1}) \neq 0$. If $i = \ell$, then $wh = v = vx_{i+1}$. If $i \neq \ell$, then $x_{i+1} \in X^{\pm 1} - \{x_-\}$; here, κ is constant on $(vx_{i+1})\star = (v)(x_{i+1}\star) \supseteq \{vx_{i+1}, wh\}$. In both cases, the desired result is clear.

As $w \neq 1 \neq wh$, $\kappa(w) = \kappa(wh)$ by (5.1.3). Thus, no X-turn of h joins V_1 to V_2.

We remark that the case where $i = \ell$ shows that if $x_\ell \neq x_-$, then $\chi(\tau x_\ell) = \chi(\iota 1)$ and, hence, $\tau x_\ell \in V_1$. If R is entirely cyclic, then the reduced $X^{\pm 1}$-sequence for $\hbar$ is cyclically reduced. Now $\hbar, \hbar^{-1} \in (H_1 \cup H_2) - \{1\}$, and the reduced $X^{\pm 1}$-sequence for $\hbar$ or $\hbar^{-1}$ ends with an element of $X^{\pm 1} - \{x_-\}$. Hence, $V_1 - \{\iota 1\} \neq \emptyset$.

It now suffices to show that no $\mathbb{W}(X,R)$-edge joins V_1 to V_2 in $\mathbb{W}(X,R) \cup \{\iota 1\}$. Consider any $r \in R$. It suffices to show that no X-turn of r joins V_1 to V_2. By the foregoing, it suffices to find some $h \in H_1 \cup H_2$ such that X-turns$(r) \subseteq X$-turns(h). Since $H_1 * H_2$ is an R-alloting F-factorization, either r is a straight word, $r \in H_1 \cup H_2$, and we may take $h = r$, or r is a cyclic word, r contains some element h' of $H_1 \cup H_2$, whence X-turns$(r) \subseteq X$-turns(h'^2), and we may take $h = h'^2$. □

5.2. **Theorem.** *If F is any finite-rank free group, R any finite set of nontrivial words in F, and X any R-cutvertex-free F-basis, then the atomic $(R \cup X)$-alloting F-factorization $* \mathcal{H}$ of* Proposition 2.3 *is an atomic R-alloting F-factorization.*

Proof. For each $H \in \mathcal{H}$, H is an $(R_{|H} \cup X_{|H})$-atom, and there exist no $(X_{|H}, R_{|H})$-cutvertices; by Lemma 5.1, H is an $R_{|H}$-atom, as desired. □

References

Berge, John: Corollary 2.5 of Stallings(1999). (1993)

Bestvina, Mladen: Theorem 49 of Martin(1995). (1995)

Cooke, Alistair: Talk about America 1951–1968. The Bodley Head, London (1968)

Dicks, Warren: On free-group algorithms that sandwich a subgroup between free-product factors. J. Group Theory **17**, 13–28 (2014).

Gersten, S. M.: On Whitehead's algorithm. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **10**, 281–284 (1984).

Hoare, A. H. M.: On automorphisms of free groups I. J. London Math. Soc. (2) **38**, 277–285 (1988).

Kurosch, Alexander: Die Untergruppen der freien Produkte von beliebigen Gruppen. Math. Ann. **109**, 647–660 (1934).

Martin, Rainer: Non-uniquely ergodic foliations of thin type, measured currents and automorphisms of free groups. PhD thesis, UCLA (1995).

Serre, Jean-Pierre: Arbres, amalgames, SL_2. Cours au Collège de France rédigé avec la collaboration de Hyman Bass. Astérisque **46**. Soc. Math. de France, Paris (1977).

Shenitzer, Abe: Decomposition of a group with a single defining relation into a free product. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **6**, 273–279 (1955).

Stallings, John R.: Whitehead graphs on handlebodies. pp. 317–330 in Geometric group theory down under (eds. John Cossey, Charles F. Miller III, Walter D. Neumann, and Michael Shapiro), Walter de Gruyter, Berlin (1999).

Stong, Richard: Diskbusting elements of the free group. Math. Res. Lett. **4**, 201–210 (1997).

Whitehead, J. H. C.: On certain sets of elements in a free group. Proc. London Math. Soc. (2) **41**, 48–56 (1936a).

Whitehead, J. H. C.: On equivalent sets of elements in a free group. Ann. of Math. (2) **37**, 782–800 (1936b).

Departament de Matemàtiques,
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona,
E-08193 Bellaterra (Barcelona),
SPAIN
E-mail address: dicks@mat.uab.cat
Home page: http://mat.uab.cat/~dicks/